

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-17 have been canceled in favor of new claims 18-29. Claims 18-29 have been drafted to avoid the issue underlying the objections applied to claims 9, 16, and 17. Support for the subject matter of claims 18-29 is provided for example in the original claims.

Claims 1 and 6-17 were rejected, under 35 USC §102(b), as being anticipated by Choi et al. (US 2003/0091066). Claims 2-4 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Choi. Claim 5 was rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Choi in view of Yang et al. (US 2005/0163150). To the extent these rejections may be deemed applicable to new claims 18-29, the Applicants respectfully traverse as follows.

Claim 18 recites features of canceled claims 1 and 11 and defines a wireless communication method in which a media access controller of a receiving station, upon detecting a particular signal, interprets a first idle time slot subsequent to transmission as being reserved for a network controller to gain a prioritized medium access. The Office Action proposes that Choi discloses this feature in paragraph 54, lines 4-9, by disclosing that a station waits a time period equal to SIFS instead of PIFS after receiving an errant response frame (see Office Action page 6, lines 4-8) of last paragraph).

However, Choi discloses that upon receiving an errant response frame, a hybrid coordinator (HC) may retransmit a frame or transmit another frame within a period of time equal to SIFS from the end of the received frame (see Choi paragraph [0054], lines 6-9). Thus, Choi discloses that a first idle slot is reserved for the device that detected a particular signal, whereas

claim 18 recites that a first idle slot is reserved for a different device to gain prioritized access than that which detected a particular signal. More specifically, claim 18 recites that a media access controller detects the particular signal and the first idle slot is reserved for a network controller to gain prioritized access, which is significantly different from Choi's disclosure of an HC that detects a particular signal and has reserved access to transmit a frame in a first idle slot SIFS.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that Choi does not anticipate the subject matter defined by new claim 18. Independent claim 24 similarly recites the above-mentioned subject matter distinguishing method claim 18 from Choi, but with respect to an apparatus. Therefore, allowance of claims 18 and 24 and all claims dependent therefrom is considered to be warranted.

Claim 25 recites features of canceled claim 8 and defines a method for reducing medium access overhead in a wireless network. According to this method, an inter-frame space is interpreted, when a particular signal is detected, to have a shorter time slot than is usually allocated.

The Office Action proposes that Choi discloses, in lines 6-9 of paragraph 54, that, when a particular signal is detected, an SIFS period is employed between frames rather than the longer PIFS period (see Office Action page 4, lines 12-16). However, Choi does not disclose the subject matter proposed in the Office Action and mentions nothing with respect to PIFS within the cited text. And contrary to the Office Action's proposal, Choi discloses in Fig. 5 that a recovery operation, which occurs when the particular signal is detected, has a longer inter-frame period than does a normal operation, in which an HC has access to a channel. More specifically,

Choi clearly discloses that the normal operation only has an inter-frame period of PIFS (see Choi the sequence of reference characters 510, 520, 610, 620, 630, 510 in Figs. 5 and 6 and paragraph [0052], line 1, through paragraph [0053], line 3), whereas the recovery operation requires both PIFS and the first slot following PIFS (see the sequence of reference characters 510-550 and paragraphs [0046]-[0049]). Thus, Choi discloses providing a longer inter-frame space, when a particular signal is detected, than is usually allocated, which is the opposite of the claimed subject matter.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Choi does not anticipate the subject matter defined by claim 25. Independent claims 28 and 29 similarly recite the above-mentioned subject matter distinguishing claim 25 from Choi. Therefore, allowance of claims 25, 28, and 29 and all claims dependent therefrom is considered to be warranted.

Claim 23 defines a wireless transmitter that reduces an inter-frame space using a second signal showing the inter-frame space defined by a receiving station based on a first signal. Choi does not disclose reducing an inter-frame space using a second signal showing the inter-frame space defined by a receiving station based on a first signal, and Yang is not cited for supplementing the teachings of Choi in this regard.

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that Choi and Yang, considered individually or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the subject matter defined by claim 23. Therefore, allowance of claim 23 is deemed to be warranted.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James E. Ledbetter/

Date: October 15, 2008
JEL/DWW/att

James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. 009289-06170
Dickinson Wright, PLLC
1875 Eye Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C.
20006-5420
Telephone: (202) 457-0160
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559